

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
February 19, 2014
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Roberta Tragarz, Lana Wong, Craig Rutan, Aracely Mora, Rudy Frias, Steven Deeley, Aaron Voelcker, Mary Mettler, John Hernandez, Craig Nance, Rudy Tijptahadi, Janis Perry, Leigh Ann Unger, Mary Walker, Scott Howell

Absent: Rudy Carrion, Joe Geissler, Jose Vargas, Steve Kawa

Santiago Canyon College
Mission Statement

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, act, communicate and think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing an accessible, a transferable, and an engaging education to a diverse community.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome		
2. Approval minutes of the December 4, 2013		Craig Nance moved to approve the minutes, with one correction; Craig Rutan seconded the motion; the minutes were unanimously approved.
3. Finalize Prioritization Rubric	<p>Discussion of setting the value of the criteria for the prioritization rubric:</p> <p>Column: One-Time or Ongoing</p> <p>Craig Rutan: There should be a distinction made from one time need and on-going expenses for equipment and supplies.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Part of the ranking relates to whether an item will be an on-going expense vs. one- time expense vs. a combination.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: I would suggest evaluating an item on all of the other criteria and considering whether or not an item will be a one- time expense or an on-going expense separately.</p> <p>John Hernandez: Do not assign a point system based on whether or not an item is an on-going or one-time expense, have two separate lists.</p> <p>Craig Nance: Keep the points but set aside that particular criteria from the total points.</p>	.

Craig Rutan: Should an item that is a one-time cost be given a priority over an item that is an on-going expense?

Column: Maintaining Standards

Janis Perry: Is this for quality or standards across the State?

Corinna: Should we take out the maintaining standard column?

Mary Walker: Some of the items in these columns might be imbedded in Program Review.

Leigh Ann Unger: What about requests that don't meet the College goals or aren't part of Program Review?

Aracely: These are questions that we need to spend time thinking about.

Mary Walker: We could list the SCC goals in columns and check a box if the item meets a particular goal.

Craig Rutan: What if a requestor submits an item and checks 8 College goals to make a stronger case for their item which then puts the burden on the PIE Committee?

Janis Perry: Have the requestor do a narrative verifying the rationale for meeting each one of the goals.

Craig Rutan: That will work for the instructional area but not Administrative Services. This must be a transparent process. If it doesn't meet the mission or at least one of the goals, it doesn't meet the criteria.

Aracely Mora: What would be requested that doesn't meet the mission?

Rudy Tijptahadi: The number system clarifies the strength of the request.

Aracely Mora: We are trying to make the process as un-subjective as possible but some judgment will still be required.

Craig Rutan: Integrated planning requires that the goals be tied to requests.

John Hernandez: At a minimum, a request has to match the mission and the goals.

Corinna: To recap, you have approved the following columns:

- *Program Review*
- *DPP*
- *SLO*

But you are not sure about *Maintaining Standards*.

John Hernandez: The Vice Presidents' or Divisions' priorities will align with the individual requests.

Lana Wong: The request would have been vetted by the Division and by the appropriate Vice President before reaching PIE. PIE should consider how the request meets the *Education Master Plan*, the *Technology Master Plan*, and, the College goals and mission.

Aracely Mora: For the requests involving instruction, the Division would prioritize, not the Vice President.

Corinna Evett: Would we request the Vice Presidents compile one document to submit to PIE?

John Hernandez: For Student Services, yes, we created a rubric to prioritize requests.

Aracely Mora: The Chairs prioritized requests from the Divisions, the Vice President of Academic Affairs did not make revisions.

John Hernandez: How would the Vice President submit a request without a Program Review?

Craig Rutan: In the Math & Sciences Division, the Dean did submit a request which was included in the prioritized requests.

Aracely Mora. Academic Affairs does have a DPP. If you don't have a DPP, how would you request items?

Mary Mettler: You could add a box for the Foundation as an exception for items not addressed at the Division level.

Corinna Evett: So, you want to add columns for facilities and technology? The *Education Master Plan* contains the College's goals.

Do you want check marks or numerical values?

	<p>Aracely Mora: A goal without a plan is a wish.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: We just decided that the Plans reinforce the goals, right? What is in the Master Plans are encompassed in the goals.</p> <p>Lana Wong: PIE ties up all campus planning. When looking at the budget, we will consider a technology plan but it isn't possible to fund all legitimate proposals. The Master Plans have gone through the entire collegiate process.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Will the criteria be considered equal or will we award different points for different criteria? Will <i>Program Review</i> be equivalent to <i>Safety</i>? Will <i>Legally Mandated</i> items be automatically approved? Will <i>Replacement Needs</i> have lower numerical value than <i>Safety</i> or <i>Legally Mandated</i>?</p> <p>Aracely Mora: Replacing computers is not as important as safety.</p> <p>Rudy Tijptahadi: Software may be a higher replace priority than computers.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Prioritizing requests from lowest to highest may be an incentive for completing an area's Program Review.</p> <p>Roberta Tragarz: The DPP is fluid.</p> <p>Mary Mettler: Will the chart identify the year the request was made? Should the fact that a request has been made a number of years be noted in the chart?</p> <p>Corinna Evett: That can be noted in the Program Review.</p>	<p>Corinna called for a vote on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keeping <i>Replacement Needs</i> as criteria. 2. Keeping <i>Maintaining Standards</i> as criteria. <p>The vote was yes.</p> <p>The vote was no.</p> <p>Craig Nance moved to adjourn at 5:05 p.m.; the motion as seconded by Craig Rutan. It was unanimously passed.</p>
<p>4. Develop Instructions for Submitting Prioritized Lists to PIE</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	

5. Questions/others	None	
Next meeting	Wednesday, March 5, 2014, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., E-308	